

REMARKS

Applicants have amended pages 3, 7 and 14 of the specification, claims 1, 6, 12-14 and 24 and canceled claims 2-5. New claims 35-36 are presented. Claims 1 and 6-36 are pending. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

Pages 3, 7 and 14 of the specification have been amended to correct grammatical errors. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Claims 1 and 24 been amended to recite the polymer of original claim 4. No new matter has been added. Claims 6 and 12-13 have been amended to be consistent with amended claim 1.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite the polymer of original claim 2. No new matter has been added.

New claim 35 is presented. Claim 35 is claim 25 (indicated as allowed), rewritten in independent form.

New claim 36 is presented. Claim 36, which depends from now-amended claim 14, recites the polymer of original claim 4.

Enclosed is a check for \$86.00 to cover the fee for one independent claim over the three previously paid for.

112 Rejection

Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The rejection indicated that the claims state "a secondary alkyl sulfonate" as a surfactant component and that the specification does not support thus a claim. Applicants disagree.

Claim 14 recites that the surfactant is "selected from the group consisting of: primary or secondary alcohol ethoxylate, secondary alkane sulfonate, secondary alcohol sulfonate, alpha olefin sulfonate, linear alkyl benzene sulfonate, primary alcohol ethoxy carboxylate, sarconsinates, or mixtures thereof." There is no recitation of "a secondary alkyl sulfonate"; there is a recitation of a "secondary alkane sulfonate". Support for a "secondary alkane sulfonate" can be found throughout the application, for example, page 6, line 29. Also, page 13, line 5 states that "SAS" used in the exemplary embodiments is a "secondary alkane sulphonate 30%".

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Art Rejections

Claims 1-3, 7-13 and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by WO 96/29451.

Claims 1-3, 7-13 and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,687,858 (Geisler et al.).

Claims 14, 17-23 and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,710,120 (Kanluen et al.).

Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,803,986 (Baeck et al.).

Claims 24 and 26-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,710,116 (Miracle et al.).

In light of the amendments above, Applicants contend that these rejections are moot and request they be withdrawn.

Applicants note that claim 4 was not rejected. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the polymer in the cleaning composition is a sulphonated-hydrophobically modified polyacrylate. There is no reference cited that discloses a cleaning composition having the elements recited in claim 1, a sulphonated-hydrophobically modified polyacrylate. Claim 1, as amended, is allowable. Claims 6-13, which depend from claim 1, are likewise allowable.

Independent claims 14 and 24 have been amended to include the recitation of an acid-substituted acrylic polymer in the claimed composition.

Claim 14 was rejected in the Office Action as anticipated by Baeck et al. Baeck et al. does not disclose including an acid-substituted acrylic polymer, nor does Baeck et al. suggest including such a polymer. Claim 14, as amended, is not anticipated nor suggested by Baeck et al., and is allowable. Claims 15-23 and 36, which depend from claim 14, are likewise allowable.

Claim 24 was rejected in the Office Action as anticipated by Miracle et al. Miracle et al. does not disclose including a sulphonated-hydrophobically modified polyacrylate, nor does Miracle et al. suggest including such a polymer. Claim 24, as amended, is not anticipated nor suggested by Miracle et al., and is allowable. Claims 25-34, which depend from claim 24, are likewise allowable.

*Application Serial no. 09/965,744
Amendment dated April 5, 2004
Response to Office Action of Dec. 4, 2003*

Original claim 25, indicated as allowed in the Office Action, has been rewritten as new claim 35.

Summary

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: April 5, 2004



Mara E. Liepa
Reg. No. 40,066

23552

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE